

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The following addresses the issues in the order in which they have been raised in the Office Action.

Drawings

The objection to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) is believed to be unnecessary in view of Applicants' explanation given below regarding the claim language *multiplexer circuit ... a control input coupled to the output of the comparator circuit*.

Claim Objections

The objections to several informalities in claims 1-16 have been addressed in the amendment here to claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 10 and 11. These amendments further clarify language that is believed to have been sufficiently clear and, thus, do not alter the scope of the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action at page 4 finds that because the claim recites *the multiplexer circuit having ... a control input coupled to the output of the comparator circuit*, and that element 420 in Fig. 4B of the Specification, which is a multiplexer, has its control input coupled to the output of a priority encoder 416, rather than directly to the output of the comparator circuit 408 or 412, that this makes it unclear whether Applicants' had a grasp of the invention. To obviate this issue, claim 10 has been amended to recite an encoder, between the comparator and the control input of the multiplexer, thereby rendering the claim explicitly supported in Fig. 4B of the Specification as filed.

Applicants welcome the indication of Allowable Subject Matter in claims 1-9, as well as the Statement of Reasons for allowable subject matter. Upon entry of this amendment, it is believed that all claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP


Dated: July 25, 2007

By 
Farzad E. Amini, Reg. No. 42,261

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
Telephone (310) 207-3800
Facsimile (408) 720-8383

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

 7/25/07
Suzanne Johnston Date